



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

thousand were gathered from all parts of the state, and with their bright helmets, beautiful fire engines of the latest invention, and fine horses constituted a spectacle to be proud of, and, we venture to think, a more wholesome spectacle than a military or naval display, and more suggestive of the coming civilization, whose glory will not be battle, murder, and sudden death, but life-saving and coöperation in all that makes for life and human service."

. . . It is now authoritatively reported that the proposed anti-foreign mining law will go no further in the Mexican parliament, because of President Diaz's pronounced opposition to it. The policy of the Mexican government is to encourage the investment of foreign capital and to welcome the people of other countries to Mexican soil.

. . . While Hon. Seth Low, ex-mayor of New York and delegate to the first Hague Conference, was making campaign speeches in Kentucky in October, he visited Berea College on Sunday morning and gave to the students and faculty what the *Berea Quarterly* describes as "a wonderful address" on the World's Movement towards Peace.

. . . At the annual convention of the Maine State Teachers' Association, which met some time ago in Portland, a strong resolution in support of international arbitration was unanimously adopted. This action was taken at the suggestion of Miss Alice May Douglas, superintendent of the Peace and Arbitration Department of the Maine W. C. T. U.

### Arbitration, but Not Armaments.\*

BY WILLIAM I. HULL, PH.D., PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN SWARTHMORE COLLEGE.

President Roosevelt has been the fountain-head of most of the streams of public interest pouring through our country during the last eight years; but his advocacy of a great American navy has added not only an element of public interest, but one of great public menace as well. The championship of that cause by Admiral Evans and Captain Hobson, or even by the editor of *The Outlook*, is not nearly so important as is its advocacy by our President.

I am one of the millions of Americans who have a profound respect for President Roosevelt's honesty of purpose and a genuine admiration for his great abilities. I am also one of the millions of Americans who deprecate heartily many of his methods, and especially do I believe his favorite method of attempting to preserve international peace to be radically wrong. Gladly and gratefully I recognize the services rendered by him to the cause of peace in some ways. I do not forget that it was on his initiative that the Hague Court of Arbitration was called into beneficent activities, nor do I forget that it was due largely to his initiative that the Peace of Portsmouth was achieved and the terrible Russo-Japanese War brought to an end. But it is precisely because of President Roosevelt's character and ability, and be-

cause of such services as these which he has rendered to the cause of peace, that his championship of a great armament in the name of peace makes him the most serious menace to its preservation. He is, in fact, the Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde of the peace movement. This is a serious charge, but I believe that the following considerations will substantiate it.

European statesmanship for centuries acted in a half-hearted way upon the old adage that the best method of preserving peace is to prepare for war; but it remained for Bismarck, that man of blood and iron, to translate that old adage into a positive philosophy and apply it in such a thorough-going manner that he made of Prussia an armed camp. The other continental countries of Europe have followed as closely as possible in the path marked out by him, and to-day we have the spectacle of Europe bristling with bayonets and filled with the din of warlike preparations, all in the great name of Peace.

Across the English Channel this "barracks philosophy" of peace has been translated into a big navy philosophy of peace, and it has become a cardinal doctrine of British statesmanship that Britain's navy must be equal in fighting strength to the navies of any other two powers.

Across the Atlantic the big navy philosophy of peace has been adopted by Mr. Roosevelt and his school, and Britain's "two-power policy" has been translated into the "two-ocean policy"; that is, the maintenance of fleets on both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans able to cope with any fleet which may be sent against them. In support of this new gospel of peace, missionaries from North Carolina and elsewhere are sowing the seed which has been grown in the editorial gardens of *The Outlook* and in Mr. Roosevelt's fields of statesmanship.

The ablest exposition of this gospel with which we are familiar is President Roosevelt's address at the Naval War College in Newport last summer. This address was not intended, Mr. Roosevelt said, for the naval officers in his audience, but was intended as a message to the great body of American citizens. About three of its paragraphs were devoted to assertions of the desirability of peace; while about three columns were devoted to an exhortation of preparedness for war. Thus it very forcibly reminded students of history of that jingle quoted so often in seventeenth-century England and inspiring the well-known "jingo" school of statesmen in all lands ever since:

"We don't want to fight,  
But, by jingo, if we do,  
We've got the ships,  
We've got the men,  
We've got the money, too."

The "big stick" of the President's argument in this address contained the following notches: First, we need a big navy in order to enforce our immigration policy. If we desire to restrict immigration from Italy, Bohemia or Japan, we must be ready to fight for it. Secondly, we need a big navy to enforce the Monroe Doctrine. Thirdly, we need a navy so big that no other nation will dare to attack us. And, fourthly, we need a big navy which, cut loose from its fortified ports, may seek for its opponent and "hammer that opponent until he quits fighting."

\* From an address made at Twelfth Street Meeting House, Philadelphia, November 10, 1908.

Without dwelling on the first two arguments, it may be said of the first that the United States has found its immigration policy in danger only when it has not lived up to the spirit of its treaties with foreign nations; or when, for commercial advantages, promises have been made to foreign nations whose fulfillment would not have been in keeping with the genius of our civilization.

Of the second, it may be said that long before the Rooseveltian régime of naval expansion, the Monroe Doctrine was enforced. For example, President Lincoln and President Cleveland were successful in this direction, and were successful not because of the possession of a big navy or threat of war, but because of the enlightened public opinion which put a brake upon the pugnacious governments concerned in France, in England and in the United States.

The third argument is based upon that cheerful mediæval view of one's neighbors as a gang of bandits ready to seize the first opportunity of indulging themselves in warfare and other knavery. In view of the pacific development of modern public opinion throughout the civilized world, and in view of America's geographical isolation and advantages of manifold variety, this mediæval view of the family of nations is on the face of it so absurd that it makes the thoughtful inquirer suspect that a sinister design underlies it. It is in fact a too palpable reminder of those good old times when military despots procured great standing armies by playing upon the fierce and the ignorant jealousies of their subjects.

Mr. Roosevelt's fourth argument in favor of a great navy in the interests of peace is a naïve revelation of the true logic of his position. The candid suggestion that our own fleets pursue the peaceful and civilized industry of "hammering," whilst our opponents are engaged in the warlike and savage brutality of "fighting," provokes an involuntary smile. But this argument is no laughing matter to the genuine lover of peace and arbitration. It constitutes the chip upon Uncle Sam's shoulder which foreigners are dared to knock off at their peril.

The folly and the wickedness of our enormously increasing armaments may be illustrated in many ways. But in reply to the four arguments noted above may be mentioned here the four following: First, the economical burden of great armaments has been proved by columns of statistics. The enormous sums which are expended upon them, and which leave some nations so poor when war comes that they are helpless to pursue it to a successful conclusion, are patent to all. But the misdirection of labor and capital applied to such uses is especially to be resented in a country whose natural resources are in such need of development as in ours. The President's conference with the governors in regard to the preservation and development of our natural resources, and his commission on the improvement of the condition of the American farmer, could be very materially aided by diverting to them a portion of the government's military and naval appropriations, which have increased to almost three-fifths of the total appropriations. The present naval policy seems destined to result in each one of the States of the Union having as its namesake a man-of-war. A short mathematical calculation would reveal the number of miles of macadamized roads or the development in the educational system which might be procured in

each State by foregoing the honor of a naval leviathan as a namesake.

Secondly, not only is the expense of building and maintaining a warship (which is said to be equivalent to the endowment and maintenance of a first-rate university, like Johns Hopkins) to be deplored, but its folly is apparent when the said ships' short life of usefulness is considered. We are told that the "life" of the best man-of-war is from twelve to twenty years. This means that every generation must not only build but rebuild its fleet of warships. We are told, also, that ships of the Dreadnought type are supremely valuable as fighters only, and that they have no proportionate power of defense. Certain it is that the invention of new devices of attack has made ships of the very best known type obsolete within a few years. And if the present rate of development in the art of navigating the air is maintained for a few years, the entire armaments of civilized nations on land and sea will be worth, for fighting purposes, an equivalent quantity of old junk. The folly of the big and bigger and biggest navy policy is apparent, also, when we remember that a "big navy" or a "big stick" is only a relative term. We are told that in 1907 the United States achieved second place in the list of naval powers, but that Germany and Japan have been making frantic efforts to oust us from that position. Our stick may be a big one when it is ten feet long, while Germany's and Japan's is only five feet long; but when theirs grows to ten feet, our stick will no longer be a big one. If England is determined to maintain a navy equal to that of any other two powers, and we are determined to maintain fleets on both oceans capable of coping with any which may be sent against them, the old mathematical puzzle is revived of an invincible force meeting an immovable obstacle. Sensible men are therefore inquiring where this policy is to end.

In the third place, President Roosevelt's armament policy invites the very evil of warfare which he deplors. He looks upon his navy as merely a means of defense; other nations inevitably regard it as a defiance and a menace. The very worst feature of the big navy policy, then,—immeasurably worse than its expense and its folly from the military point of view,—is that it is the chief obstacle to the perfecting of an adequate system of international arbitration. Both reason and experience prove that it has this disastrous result.

If in a "state of nature" my neighbor and I should desire to establish a court for the adjudication of differences between us, the worst possible method of procedure to accomplish that end would be to equip our lawns with tigers, lions and all the other animals of the jungle. If, for alleged purposes of defense, I were so to equip my lawn, my neighbor would inevitably look upon me either as a hypocrite, in pretending to desire a court, or as a bully who did not intend to abide by the decisions of that court. And the inevitable result of such a method would be not a court of justice, but a war so fierce and brutal that no jungle has ever seen its like.

At the first Hague Conference Count Munster of Germany and Admiral Fisher of Great Britain are reported to have opposed Lord Pauncefoot's plan for a court of arbitration, for the reason that, since Germany's army and the British fleet were ready and able to crush their opponents on short notice, it would be foolish for

them to submit their differences to a court of arbitration and thus to give their opponents time for preparing their defense. At the second Hague Conference, when Ruy Barbosa of Brazil was asserting against Mr. Choate's Court of Arbitral justice the argument of the equality of sovereign states, there rolled beneath his words and within the hearts of the representatives of other smaller states the conviction that the United States was not sincere in its attempt to establish a truly impartial court of justice. With the shadow of an enormously increasing navy behind our American delegation, it was unable to overcome the privately-expressed sentiment of its opponents, "We do not *trust* you, gentlemen." When trial by jury for criminal offenses took the place of trial by battle, the great reform was not accomplished by increasing the weight of the armor or lengthening the spears of England's citizens. The history of disarmament on the Great Lakes between the United States and Canada, and of the limitation of armaments on the frontier between Chile and Argentina, as well as the story of the increase of armaments on the Transvaal-Cape Colony boundary and in the Rhineland, are further facts which show the folly and wrong of the attempt to procure arbitration by means of increasing armaments. In view, then, of the plain lesson taught by reason and experience as to the inevitable and insuperable antagonism between increasing armaments and increasing arbitration, is it not an outrage that the President of our republic should lend his powerful aid to the activities of such associations as the North Carolina "Peace Society," so called, and of such "statesmen" as Captain Hobson, or that these should be permitted to handicap the work of such international statesmen as Mr. Choate and M. Bourgeois in their gallant efforts in behalf of arbitral justice?

Finally, the increasing armaments policy is bitterly condemned by millions of Americans because it is dethroning the ideal of America as the Sir Galahad among the nations. There was a time when it could be truly said, and without a shadow of doubt or suspicion on the part of the other members of the family of nations, that our country's "strength was as the strength of ten, because its heart was *pure*." That ideal of the youthful, peaceful giant of the West, whose ports were without a gun and whose warships were designed solely to perform the police duty of the seas, has been trailed in the dust before the nations, and we are fast coming to be classed with those military despots who, from the time of Babylon and ancient Rome, have made a desert and called it peace.

When Madame Roland ascended the guillotine during the French Revolutionary terror, and looked around her upon the so-called "liberty" caps and "patriot" costumes of the men who had strewn the streets of Paris with the bodies and blood of the guillotine's victims, she exclaimed: "O Liberty, Liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name!" And when the advocate of peace by means of arbitration hears arbitration acclaimed by those who are intent on the enormous and indefinite increase of our army and navy, he may well exclaim: "O Peace, Peace, what crimes are committed in thy name!"

Let us, then, before it be too late,—before the poison in *The Outlook's* editorials, written and to be written, has irretrievably entered into the blood of our nation,—

let us put an end in our new world to this pernicious peace philosophy of the old world's men of blood and iron; let us make right, and not might, our motto; let us make justice, and not victory on land or sea, our aim; let us make arbitration, and not armaments, our methods; and let us seek as our leader towards the goal of international peace, not any god of battle, but the Prince of Peace.

## The Case for Limitation of Armaments.

BY BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD.

(Reprinted from the October number of the *American Journal of International Law*.)

The question of limitation and even of gradual reduction of armaments must be carefully differentiated from that of disarmament, complete and thorough-going. The demand for limitation of armaments put forward by the leaders of the peace movement is often unfairly assumed to be a demand for total disarmament. The most advanced pacifists, in whatever nation they may be found, and however radical may be their views theoretically as to the duty of the nations to disarm and live together in permanent peace under the dominion of love and law, are not at the present time urging disarmament as a practical measure. They know very well that before the happy time shall come when nations will "beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks" in any general way, a very wide educational work for the removal of false conceptions and old prejudices must be done, and the process of *rapprochement* among the nations, now so happily taking place, must be carried much farther than it has yet gone. The practical thing which they are demanding—and, as they think, on the best of grounds—is the immediate arrest of the present feverish rivalry in armaments and of the attending rapid increase in the already colossal army and navy budgets. This step they hold to be not only perfectly reasonable and practicable under the present conditions of the nations in their relations one to another, but also imperatively demanded in the interests of justice and the common welfare of the populations on whom the burden of keeping up the exhausting rivalry falls with such peculiar oppressiveness. Only the salient features of the argument, or group of arguments, by which this demand of the pacifists is supported, can be developed in a single article.

The first and most impressive contention of the friends of peace of this way of thinking is that civilization is now so far advanced that not only is war itself out of date, but the colossal preparations for war, which meet the view in whatever direction one turns, are thoroughly out of harmony with the spirit, the social habits, the intellectual attainment, and the philanthropic institutions of the age. When one puts this general character of our civilization over against the colossal armaments of the time and looks at them with clear eye, the judgment pronounced is very much like that made when one looks at black and white; their total unlikeness is seen without any argument. Private war, which for many generations ravaged Europe, has disappeared. The duel remains in but few civilized countries, and where it is still tolerated it is for the most part a farce. Personal fights with fist or club are to-day nearly unknown, except among thugs and drunken brawlers, which constitute a very small portion of any